

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff,**

v.

**SYLVESPA EUGENE ADAMS (01),
Defendant.**

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

No. 3:12-CR-427-L

**FINDINGS CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), Petitioner World Finance Group, LLC's ("Petitioner") Petition for Hearing to Determine Rights and/or Proceeds as Relates to Seized and Forfeited Property ("Petition for Hearing") [D.E. 722] has been referred to United States Magistrate Judge Paul D. Stickney for proposed findings and recommendations for disposition. *See* Order of Reference [D.E. 723]. The undersigned set a hearing on this matter for July 2, 2014. *See* Order [D.E. 727]. On June 25, 2014, Petitioner and the United States (the "Parties") filed a stipulation wherein Petitioner agreed to the entry of a final order forfeiting to the United States the subject property, a 2005 Bentley Continental, VIN SCBCR63W45C029466 (the "Subject Property"), and providing for the payment of Petitioner's interest in the amount of \$51,550.56 as full settlement and satisfaction of all of Petitioner's claims in the Subject Property. *See* Stipulation [D.E. 729 at 2]. In light of the Parties' agreement regarding the rights and proceeds of the Subject Property at issue in the Petition for Hearing, the undersigned respectfully recommends that the Court enter a final order pursuant to the Parties' agreed terms as set out in their Stipulation [D.E. 729].

SO RECOMMENDED, this 14th day of July, 2014.



PAUL D. STICKNEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT**

The United States District Clerk shall serve a true copy of these findings, conclusions, and recommendation on the parties. Pursuant to Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b)(1), any party who desires to object to these findings, conclusions, and recommendation must serve and file written objections within fourteen days after service of the findings, conclusions, and recommendation. A party filing objections must specifically identify those findings, conclusions, or recommendation to which objections are being made. The District Court need not consider frivolous, conclusory, or general objections. A party's failure to file such written objections to these proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation shall bar that party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Additionally, any failure to file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation within fourteen days after service shall bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the Magistrate Judge that are accepted by the District Court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).